

Message

From: Poulson, Zane@Waterboards [Zane.Poulson@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: 6/25/2018 3:28:25 PM
To: Mitchell, Matthew [Mitchell.Matthew@epa.gov]
CC: Fitzgerald, Rebecca@Waterboards [Rebecca.Fitzgerald@waterboards.ca.gov]
Subject: FW: Toxicity Economic Analysis
Attachments: R5_NonSW Industrial Plants.xlsx; r5-2018-0003.pdf

Matt,

Here is the email I received from Matt Reusswig informing us that they have the go ahead to complete the work for the Toxicity Provision economic analysis.

Zane

From: Matt Reusswig [mailto:matt.reusswig@pgenv.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 1:39 PM
To: Poulson, Zane@Waterboards <Zane.Poulson@waterboards.ca.gov>; Dan Basoli <Dan_Basoli@abtassoc.com>
Cc: Iversen, Jacob@Waterboards <Jacob.Iversen@waterboards.ca.gov>; Beryt, Elizabeth@Waterboards <Elizabeth.Beryt@waterboards.ca.gov>; Fitzgerald, Rebecca@Waterboards <Rebecca.Fitzgerald@waterboards.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: Toxicity Economic Analysis

Hi Zane,

Today we got the go-ahead from Ali, so I and my colleagues are going to proceed.

Attached you'll find the list I generated of the Region 5 non-stormwater industrial plants possessing permits issued in 2017 or 2018. The plant I randomly selected is the Royal Mountain King Mine (see attached for their 2018 permit).

Please review this selection and let me know if it works for your team. If it looks okay, let me know if you'd like me to contact the plant to request their toxicity testing reports for the years of interest.

I'm on the road this week, but please feel free to give me a call at 319-471-063 if you'd like to discuss this in greater detail.

Thanks and best regards,

Matthew Reusswig
PG Environmental
(703) 707-8258, ext 2011

From: Matt Reusswig
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2018 12:59 PM
To: Poulson, Zane@Waterboards <Zane.Poulson@waterboards.ca.gov>; Dan Basoli <Dan_Basoli@abtassoc.com>
Cc: Iversen, Jacob@Waterboards <Jacob.Iversen@waterboards.ca.gov>; Beryt, Elizabeth@Waterboards <Elizabeth.Beryt@waterboards.ca.gov>; Fitzgerald, Rebecca@Waterboards <Rebecca.Fitzgerald@waterboards.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: Toxicity Economic Analysis

Hi Zane,

I'll hold off on starting anything until we get authorization from EPA.

The element which might slow us up is getting the toxicity reports/data from the permittee. Once we have the data for the substitute plant, it should take 2-3 weeks to do the new RPA and revise the report. I and my team will do our best to quickly complete the revisions since I know you would like the draft to go to management review in the near future.

Once we get EPA authorization, I can quickly pull a list of the Central Valley Region permits from 2017 & 2018 from either CIWQS or the Regional Boards' website, so I'll take care of that and randomly select a new industrial non-stormwater plant. I'll then provide you with the plant so you can approve it before we request data from them. I and my PG colleagues assist the Central Valley Board staff with NPDES permit development, so I'm also happy to contact the permittee for the data if that would be convenient.

Please don't hesitate to let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Matthew Reusswig
PG Environmental
(703) 707-8258, ext 2011

From: Poulson, Zane@Waterboards [<mailto:Zane.Poulson@waterboards.ca.gov>]
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2018 11:28 AM
To: Matt Reusswig <matt.reusswig@pgenv.com>; Dan Basoli <Dan_Basoli@abtassoc.com>
Cc: Iversen, Jacob@Waterboards <Jacob.Iversen@waterboards.ca.gov>; Beryt, Elizabeth@Waterboards <Elizabeth.Beryt@waterboards.ca.gov>; Fitzgerald, Rebecca@Waterboards <Rebecca.Fitzgerald@waterboards.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: Toxicity Economic Analysis

Matt,

We looked further into the Region 5 permits regarding the number of concentrations that they require dischargers to use for chronic toxicity testing in their permits.

It appears that the older permits, such as Aerojet (2014) all tended to allow the discharger to use a single concentration if they wished for chronic toxicity testing. In reviewing several permits in Region 5, we found that in 2016 they began requiring dischargers to use a dilution series for chronic toxicity tests when the permits were being issued or renewed. All of the permits we reviewed that were issued or renewed in 2017 included the requirement that they use a dilution series for chronic toxicity testing.

Our view is that even though the Aerojet permit was representative of current permit conditions back when you started the initial economic analysis, the Aerojet permit is no longer representative of Region 5 NPDES permits and it should be replaced with a more current (2017 or 2018) permit from Region 5.

We can send you a list of NPDES permits from Region 5 that you can randomly select from if you wish and we can provide you a copy of that permit.

In the Routine Monitoring tables in Appendix A in the Economic Analysis we can also remove the line for "Frequency" since all of the tests must use multiple dilutions.

Please let me know if you have any questions and if you would like a list of non-storm water NPDES permits issued in Region 5 in 2017 and 2018.

Zane

From: Poulson, Zane@Waterboards
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 8:16 AM
To: 'Matt Reusswig' <matt.reusswig@pgenv.com>; Dan Basoli <Dan_Basoli@abtassoc.com>
Cc: Iversen, Jacob@Waterboards <jacob.iversen@waterboards.ca.gov>; Beryt, Elizabeth@Waterboards

<Elizabeth.Beryt@waterboards.ca.gov>

Subject: RE: Toxicity Economic Analysis

Matt,

We contacted the Regional Water Boards to look further into the four facilities that Appendix A of the Economic Analysis listed as having a single concentration test type (Aerojet Rocketdyne Inc., Warne Power Plant, LACSD San Jose Creek WRP, and Victor Valley Regional WWTP). The Regional Board staff confirmed that three of the four facilities on the list actually are required to conduct multiple concentration tests, but they are only required to report the results from the IWC. The one that is allowed by their permit to only do a single concentration test and a control is the Aerojet Rocketdyne Inc. facility. This is the only facility on the list that is allowed to do single concentration tests in their permit, but Region 5 has issued several other permits that allow this, so it is not an outlier.

We are still discussing how we want to present this in the economic analysis. NPDES dischargers are supposed to use 40 CFR, Part 136 test methods, which require multiple concentrations, unless they are granted an alternative test procedure. The Toxicity Provisions are not making any changes to this and we don't want to give the impression that the Toxicity Provisions will require any changes to the test procedures. The easiest solution may be to remove the "Test Type" from the list of components in the tables in Appendix A. The calculations would still show that Aerojet is using single concentration tests, but we don't need to highlight this issue.

I will discuss this more with our Legal Counsel and get back to you this week on this issue.

Zane

From: Matt Reusswig [mailto:matt.reusswig@pgenv.com]

Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 5:42 AM

To: Poulson, Zane@Waterboards <Zane.Poulson@waterboards.ca.gov>; Dan Basoli <Dan_Basoli@abtassoc.com>

Cc: Iversen, Jacob@Waterboards <Jacob.Iversen@waterboards.ca.gov>

Subject: RE: Toxicity Economic Analysis

Hi Zane,

I just wanted to touch base on the Toxicity EA and see if you have any updates or any new direction regarding the multiple dilution series issue. The period of performance for this work assignment doesn't end till July 31st so there's no particular rush if you'd like us to hold onto the draft a little longer, but wanted to check-in nonetheless.

Best,

Matthew Reusswig
PG Environmental
(703) 707-8258, ext 2011

From: Poulson, Zane@Waterboards [mailto:Zane.Poulson@waterboards.ca.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, April 4, 2018 7:20 PM

To: Matt Reusswig <matt.reusswig@pgenv.com>; Dan Basoli <Dan_Basoli@abtassoc.com>

Cc: Camacho, Steve@Waterboards <Steve.Camacho@waterboards.ca.gov>; Iversen, Jacob@Waterboards <Jacob.Iversen@waterboards.ca.gov>; Beryt, Elizabeth@Waterboards <Elizabeth.Beryt@waterboards.ca.gov>

Subject: RE: Toxicity Economic Analysis

Matt and Dan,

Please hold off on starting task # 1 below. We may have misinterpreted some advice from our legal counsel. I don't want you to start on work just to have us change the direction. We will consult further with our legal counsel and provide clear direction on Friday.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Zane

From: Poulson, Zane@Waterboards
Sent: Wednesday, April 4, 2018 3:59 PM
To: 'Matt Reusswig' <matt.reusswig@pgenv.com>; Dan Basoli <Dan_Basoli@abtassoc.com>
Cc: Camacho, Steve@Waterboards <Steve.Camacho@waterboards.ca.gov>; Iversen, Jacob@Waterboards <jacob.iversen@waterboards.ca.gov>; Beryt, Elizabeth@Waterboards <Elizabeth.Beryt@waterboards.ca.gov>
Subject: Toxicity Economic Analysis

Matt and Dan,

Here are the issues that were discussed in yesterday's call and the decisions that we agreed upon.

1. For the four facilities that are shown in Appendix A as going from single dilution chronic tests type under the Baseline to multiple dilution chronic test type under the Provisions facilities (Aerojet Rocketdyne Inc., Warne Power Plant, LACSD San Jose Creek WRP, and Victor Valley Regional WWTP), Abt will change the chronic test type under the Provisions to single dilution tests. This is to reflect that the Provisions will not require a change in the test methods. Abt will need to change the calculations as a result of this change and the recalculations will take about a week to complete. Also, can Abt change the name of the component from "Test Type" to "Dilution Series". That way we don't give the impression that there are different types of tests between the Baseline and the Provisions.
2. For USS-POACO Industries in Appendix A.13 Abt will verify that for the acute toxicity test type going from single concentration under the Baseline to multiple concentration under the Provisions is just a typo.
3. For the Sacramento Regional WWTP Abt will add the two single concentration monitoring points to Appendix A tables and the calculations for the facility.
4. For the Acute toxicity tests Jacob Iversen will research and provide a list of the facilities that use a flow through system to test for acute toxicity. The issue is that the Provisions leave it up to the Regional Water Board to determine if they want to require a facility to conduct a flow-through acute toxicity test. For a POTW discharger, if there permit requires them to conduct flow-through acute toxicity tests the Provisions won't necessarily change that; the Regional Board may continue to require the test. If a discharger, other than a POTW, is using a flow-through acute toxicity test that test does not satisfy the requirements of the Provisions. If the facility has reasonable potential for acute toxicity they would still need to conduct static acute toxicity tests. The frequency would be up to the Regional Board, but could not be less than once per calendar year. Once we know which facilities will be affected in Appendix A we can have further discussion on how to reflect the information in the Economic Analysis report.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Zane